

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

MACK AUTHER FOREMAN, JR.,)
#200291,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

LEIGH GWATHNEY,)

Defendant.)

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-115-WKW
[WO]

MACK AUTHER FOREMAN, JR.,)
#200291,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

DWAYNE SPURLOCK,)

Defendant.)

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-116-WKW
[WO]

MACK AUTHER FOREMAN, JR.,)
#200291,)

Plaintiff,)

v.)

CLIFF WALKER,)

Defendant.)

CASE NO. 2:21-CV-117-WKW
[WO]

MACK AUTHER FOREMAN, JR.,)	
#200291,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	CASE NO. 2:21-CV-118-WKW
v.)	[WO]
)	
CHARLES GRADDICK,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Before the court is Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration. (Doc. # 29.) Plaintiff brought these cases against the members of the Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles. On August 11, 2021, these cases were dismissed because Plaintiff failed to pay the initial partial filing fee. (Docs. # 21, 22, 23.)

On April 4, 2022, Plaintiff requested that this court order prison officials to stop withdrawing money from his inmate account for legal fees. (Doc. # 27.) In response, the court explained that Plaintiff is still obligated to pay the filing fee for these cases and that prison officials must withdraw funds from Plaintiff's inmate account for that purpose. The court therefore informed Plaintiff that it would not order prison officials to stop the payments. (Doc. # 28.)

Plaintiff now seeks different relief: Plaintiff alleges that prison officials are paying for legal fees without telling him which case is associated with each payment. (Doc. # 29 at 4.) Plaintiff requests an order directing the warden of his facility to

“reveal the name and address of each court that she sent the money to.” (Doc. # 29 at 4.)

This court does not have unlimited power to order any relief that might be just. First, the court can only operate within the confines of a “case or controversy.” U.S. Const. art. III. But Plaintiff brings forward only a motion, not a case. The original cases against the members of the Alabama Board of Pardons and Paroles have been dismissed, and Plaintiff has not moved to reopen any of these cases. Plaintiff’s requested relief is not related to these cases in such a way that jurisdiction over his current issues would continue. Second, the “case or controversy” must be the kind of case which Congress has permitted this court to hear. Plaintiff’s request for more information from his warden does not show how it falls within the subject matter jurisdiction of this federal district court. Third, even when a proper case is brought, the court can only issue orders to parties who are properly brought before it. There is no evidence that Plaintiff’s warden has appeared as a party in any of these cases.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion (Doc. # 29) is DENIED.

DONE this 26th day of April, 2022.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE